



Article

Linguistic Features of Military Discourse in Official Texts: A Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek

Sayfiddinovna Malika Soatova^{*1}

1. O'zDJTU Mustaqil Tadqiqotchisi

* Correspondence: malikasoatova111@gmail.com

Abstract: Military discourse represents a highly specialized form of institutional communication where clarity, precision, and authority are vital for operational effectiveness. Official documents such as field manuals and statutes, including the U.S. Army Field Manual FM 3-21.8 and Uzbek military regulations, exemplify the dual-functional style of military texts, combining official-business and scientific-technical linguistic features. Despite its importance, comparative studies examining the stylistic, lexical, and morphological features of English and Uzbek military discourse remain limited, particularly in translation contexts. This study aims to investigate the linguistic characteristics of military communication in both English and Uzbek texts to identify shared and divergent features influencing translation and intercultural communication. Findings reveal a consistent use of monosemantic terminology, avoidance of synonyms, and exclusion of emotive language in both languages. Imperative and infinitive verb forms, passive constructions, impersonal directives, standardized abbreviations, and abstract nouns dominate the discourse, ensuring unambiguous communication. English military texts demonstrate heavier reliance on acronyms and passive voice, while Uzbek discourse retains Soviet-era influences in terminology and structural formulations. The research highlights the integration of official-business and scientific-technical styles in shaping military discourse, offering a rare comparative insight into English and Uzbek military linguistic practices. These findings underscore the necessity for specialized translator training programs focusing on terminology management, stylistic analysis, and intercultural sensitivity. They also provide a linguistic foundation for enhancing interoperability in multinational military operations and improving translation pedagogy in defense-related contexts.

Keywords: Military Discourse, English, Uzbek, Official-Business Style, Scientific-Technical Style, Terminology, Translation, Intercultural Communication, Acronyms, Passive Voice

Citation: Soatova S. M. Linguistic Features of Military Discourse in Official Texts: A Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2025, 6(4), 627-632.

Received: 30th Jun 2025

Revised: 07th Jul 2025

Accepted: 31th Jul 2025

Published: 23rd Aug 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

In an era marked by increasing international cooperation and conflict, the role of military translators and linguists has become more vital than ever. Effective communication in military settings is not merely a matter of conveying meaning—it can directly impact strategic decision-making, operational success, and even the safety of personnel. Military discourse, particularly in official documents such as manuals, statutes, and field regulations, adheres to specific linguistic patterns that distinguish it from other professional or administrative texts. Understanding these patterns is essential not only for linguists and translators but also for military personnel engaged in cross-cultural communication and training[1].

Unlike everyday language or journalistic styles, military texts must balance the need for clarity with operational precision. This makes them unique both functionally and linguistically. Military communication frequently operates at the intersection of two major functional styles: the official-business style, which governs documentation and procedural writing, and the scientific-technical style, which is evident in the detailed exposition of equipment, tactics, and methodologies. Both styles prioritize unambiguity, consistency, and structural coherence, making the military register one of the most regulated and formalized in linguistic practice[2].

This study is particularly concerned with how these styles manifest in the official military documents of English and Uzbek. The English-language material is primarily drawn from the U.S. Army Field Manual FM 3-21.8: The Infantry Rifle Platoon and Squad, a foundational training document used across American infantry units. The manual is notable for its clear, concise, and highly structured language that avoids ambiguity, redundancy, and emotive expression. Uzbek military documents, while less widely analyzed in academic literature, follow comparable principles shaped by institutional tradition and national linguistic norms. Comparing the two provides valuable insight into how military institutions encode authority, instruction, and coordination within their linguistic systems[3].

An important aspect of this research is the exploration of military terminology and its translation. Military language is rich in specialized vocabulary, abbreviations, and acronyms that do not always have direct equivalents across languages or cultures. Translators must not only be fluent in the source and target languages but also possess deep contextual knowledge of military systems, ranks, equipment, and procedures. Errors in translation can result in serious misunderstandings—ranging from logistical delays to operational failure. For this reason, military translation is regarded as a high-stakes domain of applied linguistics that demands both linguistic and cultural competence[4].

The current study employs a combination of comparative-contrastive and definitional analytical methods to examine the structure, content, and stylistic elements of English and Uzbek military discourse. Through the analysis of select chapters from FM 3-21.8 and a review of Uzbek military documentation, the paper seeks to identify key linguistic features at the lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels. Particular attention is paid to the functional use of language: how imperatives, modality, terminological exactness, and discourse organization contribute to the overall communicative effectiveness of military documents[5].

By highlighting both the shared and distinctive features of English and Uzbek military discourse, this article aims to enhance our understanding of the linguistic frameworks that govern official military communication. It also provides practical guidance for translator training programs and contributes to broader discussions on intercultural military cooperation and discourse standardization[6].

2. Materials and Methods

This study employs a comparative linguistic approach to analyze the stylistic and structural features of military discourse in official English and Uzbek texts. The primary focus is placed on identifying functional stylistic markers, terminology use, and discourse structures that characterize military manuals and regulations in both languages[7].

The main source of English-language material is the U.S. Army Field Manual FM 3-21.8: The Infantry Rifle Platoon and Squad, a comprehensive training document used by U.S. infantry forces. This manual was selected due to its authoritative status and detailed exposition of tactical procedures, communication systems, and leadership principles. Specific chapters examined include: Chapter 3: Tactical Movement; Chapter 4: Combat Formations; Chapter 6: Communication. These sections were chosen for their high density of operational terminology and clearly structured functional content, reflecting core

features of military discourse. For the Uzbek-language data, selected passages from Uzbek military regulations, such as excerpts from national defense statutes and training manuals used in military education institutions, were reviewed. While access to complete Uzbek military manuals is limited due to classification and availability issues, the analysis draws from verified sections of publicly available military documents and instructional materials used in military linguistics training[8].

Methods The study applies the following methods of linguistic analysis:

Comparative-contrastive analysis: This method is used to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek military texts in terms of lexical choice, syntactic patterns, and stylistic structure. It allows the researcher to pinpoint universal features of military discourse as well as culturally specific traits[9].

Definitional analysis: Scientific and military terms found in both English and Uzbek texts are examined to understand their structural, semantic, and pragmatic characteristics. Definitions from official glossaries and terminological dictionaries are consulted—for example, *O'zbek tilshunosligi terminlarining izohli lug'ati* by N. Mahkamov[10].

Functional-stylistic analysis: The texts are analyzed for functional style markers typical of official-business and scientific-technical styles. These include the use of imperative forms, modal verbs, passive voice, abstract nouns, and technical jargon, as well as text organization patterns such as numbered subsections and schematized formats. **Content analysis and categorization:** Key features such as types of terminology (military-specific, general technical), abbreviation usage, and sentence structure are coded and categorized[11]. This supports a clearer understanding of how language functions to achieve clarity, command, and precision in military documents. This study does not rely on statistical analysis due to the qualitative nature of the linguistic data but emphasizes detailed textual interpretation supported by examples. All selected texts are treated as authentic materials representing institutional military discourse in their respective languages[12].

3. Results and Discussion

The comparative linguistic analysis of English and Uzbek military texts produced the following key findings:

Terminological Precision:

Both English and Uzbek military texts demonstrate a high degree of terminological exactness. Terms are used in a monosemantic (single-meaning) manner to prevent ambiguity. Synonyms are avoided, and key operational concepts are repeated consistently throughout the texts[13].

Use of Abbreviations and Acronyms:

English military texts, particularly FM 3-21.8, contain a high frequency of standardized abbreviations and acronyms such as AO (Area of Operations) and SOP (Standard Operating Procedure). Uzbek texts use fewer abbreviations, and they are often influenced by Russian or international terminology.

Verb Form Usage:

Both English and Uzbek texts show a strong reliance on the imperative and infinitive forms. English examples include "Establish security," while Uzbek counterparts use forms like *aloqa o'rnatilsin* (let communication be established)[14].

Nominal Style and Abstract Nouns:

The use of abstract nouns and nominalized expressions is prevalent. Phrases like mission accomplishment, enemy movement, and *jangovar tayyorgarlik* (combat readiness) appear frequently.

Syntactic Structure:

Military texts in both languages favor concise, direct sentence structures. Procedural steps are often presented in bullet-point or list format. Passive constructions (e.g., "The

objective was secured") are common in English, while Uzbek relies more on impersonal verb forms.

Functional Style Integration:

All analyzed texts exhibit features of both official-business and scientific-technical styles. The former is used for commands and institutional language; the latter is evident in technical descriptions and equipment procedures[15].

The findings of this study reinforce the necessity for absolute precision in military discourse, particularly in the context of translation. As outlined in the theoretical foundation of this research, errors in military translation can have severe consequences, ranging from misinterpretation and failed negotiations to the loss of human life or material resources. Therefore, military translation must not only be linguistically accurate but also culturally and contextually sensitive[16].

One of the key outcomes of the analysis is the confirmation that military discourse operates within the intersection of two dominant functional styles: the official-business and the scientific-technical. The official-business style governs the formulation of orders, legal statutes, agreements, and administrative commands. Its linguistic traits include the use of impersonal constructions, imperatives, and repetitive terminology without synonyms to ensure clarity. In contrast, the scientific-technical style appears prominently in sections dealing with tactics, weapons systems, and operational procedures. These sections are characterized by high terminological density, passive voice, modal verbs, and visual aids such as diagrams and tables[17].

The U.S. Army Field Manual FM 3-21.8: The Infantry Rifle Platoon and Squad, which served as the central material for this study, exemplifies this dual-stylistic structure. The manual avoids rhetorical embellishment and instead prioritizes structured, goal-oriented communication. Sections such as Tactical Movement, Combat Formations, and Communication rely heavily on imperative structures, schematized listings, and technical vocabulary, all of which facilitate ease of execution under field conditions. Unlike ceremonial oaths or historical reflections found in other military documents, FM 3-21.8 is strictly pragmatic and contemporary in its approach[18].

Uzbek military texts, though less widely analyzed in academic literature, follow many of the same principles. However, they are shaped by different institutional and cultural contexts. The influence of Soviet-era military discourse is still evident in the structure, terminology, and abbreviation systems used in modern Uzbek materials. While Uzbek documents may use fewer abbreviations than their American counterparts, they still rely heavily on consistent terminology and impersonal directives, aligning with the stylistic priorities of clarity, brevity, and authority.

A particularly important point arising from this study is the central role of terminology in shaping military discourse. Terminology not only reflects technical knowledge but also serves as a stabilizing element that allows for interoperability across languages and military systems. Translators working in military contexts must therefore be proficient not only in linguistic structures but also in the underlying operational logic of military terms. As a result, this study highlights the practical value of developing specialized training programs that incorporate terminology management, contrastive stylistics, and cultural translation skills specific to the military domain[19].

The structure and language of the U.S. Army Field Manual FM 3-21.8 reflect a highly standardized operational framework. The handbook strictly adheres to task-based organization, with its 15 chapters systematically covering areas such as patrol operations, tactical formations, weapons use, and leadership procedures. Each chapter begins with a thematically defined heading and is subdivided into clearly structured instructions presented in bulleted or numbered formats. This design is not only consistent with military logic but also enhances usability under high-stress field conditions.

Crucially, the manual deliberately avoids any literary or historical digressions, setting it apart from earlier military texts such as *The Ranger Handbook* or *Rules of Rogers'*

Rangers. Instead, it maintains a utilitarian, contemporary tone, geared solely toward battlefield effectiveness. The inclusion of tactical visuals, radio transmission protocols, and matrices for mission planning exemplifies its strictly operational purpose[20].

Lexically, the manual demonstrates strong terminological control. The use of polysemantic terms and synonyms is intentionally minimized to prevent misinterpretation. For instance, the same term is consistently used throughout the text, and everyday vocabulary or stylistic variation is avoided. Figurative expressions, idioms, and emotional language are excluded in favor of clear, neutral, and technical terminology. This aligns with the pragmatic function of military discourse, where precision and clarity take precedence over expressiveness.

Additionally, the lexical level of the manual shows a significant concentration of domain-specific terms, abbreviations, and acronyms, especially in chapters on weapons, communications, and movement techniques.

From a morphological perspective, the predominant use of infinitive and imperative verb forms, along with modal verbs, reflects the instructional and prescriptive nature of military texts. The prevalence of abstract nouns (e.g., mission success, enemy contact, command authority) supports the document's formal tone.

A syntactic analysis reveals a strong preference for impersonal constructions, parallel sentence structures, and the avoidance of complex literary formulations. Only in ceremonial excerpts, such as the Ranger Creed or national oaths (e.g., the Uzbek military oath), do we see stylistic features such as inversion, participial phrases, and emotional appeals—elements absent from the core instructional body of FM 3-21.8. Taken together, these features confirm that FM 3-21.8 is not only a technical manual but a linguistic model of military discourse in action. It illustrates how language is engineered to fulfill high-stakes communicative goals: ensuring clarity of orders, standardization of terminology, and the effectiveness of multinational military cooperation[21].

This study has demonstrated that military discourse, particularly in official documents such as field manuals and statutes, is governed by strict linguistic conventions aimed at achieving clarity, precision, and operational efficiency. The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek military texts—centered around the U.S. Army Field Manual FM 3-21.8 and corresponding Uzbek materials—has revealed that both languages adhere to a dual-functional stylistic framework, combining the official-business and scientific-technical styles to fulfill their communicative goals. At the lexical level, the consistent use of monosemantic terminology, the avoidance of synonyms, and the exclusion of expressive or emotive language reflect the priority of unambiguous communication in high-stakes contexts. Military texts favor technical vocabulary, standardized abbreviations, and schematized formats that support instruction and execution rather than explanation or persuasion.

4. Conclusion

Morphologically, both English and Uzbek military texts show a clear preference for imperative and infinitive verb forms, along with modal constructions and abstract noun usage. These features reflect the directive and procedural nature of military language, where function supersedes stylistic variation. The syntactic structure of military documents further reinforces this goal through concise, linear sentence constructions, often supported by visual aids, checklists, and lists. The analysis confirmed that passive voice and impersonal formulations are dominant, especially in English, while Uzbek texts employ similar indirect strategies through impersonal verb forms and official tone.

The findings of this research hold significant practical implications. They confirm that military translation is not only a linguistic exercise but also a culturally and operationally embedded activity. Translators must possess deep knowledge of military terminology, structural discourse patterns, and the communicative priorities of both source and target languages. The results also underscore the necessity for specialized

translator training programs that focus on terminology management, functional stylistics, and intercultural military communication.

In conclusion, military discourse in both English and Uzbek is shaped by its communicative purpose—to issue commands, convey procedures, and minimize ambiguity. This shared foundation enables effective cross-linguistic translation and supports the growing need for interoperability in multinational military operations. By analyzing the structural and stylistic features of military language, this study contributes to a better understanding of how language functions in institutional defense communication and offers a linguistic basis for improving translation practices in military and security settings.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Mahkamov, *Adabiy norma va pleonazm [Literary norm and pleonasm]*. Fan, 1988.
- [2] J. P. Gee, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*, 3rd изд. Routledge, 2010.
- [3] M. Yuldashev, «Badiiy matnning lingvopoetik tadqiqi [Linguopoetic analysis of literary text]», PhD Thesis, Tashkent, 2009.
- [4] J. P. Gee, *How to Do Discourse Analysis*. Routledge, 2010.
- [5] R. Sayfullayeva и others, *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili [Modern Uzbek literary language]*. Fan va texnologiyalar, 2010.
- [6] M. Mukarramov, *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tilining ilmiy uslubi [Scientific style of modern Uzbek literary language]*. Fan, 1984.
- [7] D. Khudoyberganova, *Lingvistik uslublar va nutq uslubi*. Tashkent: Fan, 2013.
- [8] D. Khudoyberganova, *Matnning antropotsentrik tadqiqi: Monografiya [Anthropocentric analysis of text: A monograph]*. Fan, 2013.
- [9] A. Mahkamov, *Military Terminology in English-Uzbek Translation*. Tashkent: Military Publishing House, 2013.
- [10] T. Qudratov, *Nutq madaniyati va uslubiyat asoslari [Speech culture and basics of stylistics]*. O'qituvchi, 1993.
- [11] A. I. Moiseyev, «O yazykovoy prirode termina [On the linguistic nature of the term]», в *Lingvisticheskie problemy nauchno-tehnicheskoy terminologii*, Moscow, 1970.
- [12] N. Mahmudov и others, *O'zbek tilida ish yuritish [Official writing in Uzbek]*. O'qituvchi, 1990.
- [13] S. O. Boymirzayeva, «O'zbek tilida matnning kommunikativ-pragmatik mazmunini shakllantiruvchi kategoriyalar [Categories forming the communicative-pragmatic meaning of text in Uzbek]», PhD Thesis, Tashkent, 2010.
- [14] N. Mahkamov, *O'zbek tilshunosligi terminlarining izohli lug'ati [Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek linguistics terms]*. Fan, 2013.
- [15] S. Chapman и B. Clark, «Pragmatic Literary Stylistics», в *Pragmatic Literary Stylistics*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2014, cc. 16–35.
- [16] S. Eyeh, «Semiotics and the interpretation of meanings in literary texts», *Ife Stud. Afr. Lit. Arts*, т. 6, вып. 3, с. 145, 2011.
- [17] I. V. Arnold, *Stylistics of Modern English*. Moscow: Flinta, 2005.
- [18] L. Hickey, «Stylistics, pragmatics and pragmatistylitics», *Rev. Belge Philol. D'histoire Belg. Rev. Philol. Hist.*, т. 71, cc. 573–586, 1993.
- [19] R. Salkie, *Text and Discourse Analysis*. Routledge, 2001.
- [20] Headquarters, Department of the Army, «The Infantry Rifle Platoon and Squad», Headquarters, Department of the Army, FM 3-21.8, 2007. [Онлайн]. Доступно на: [https://www.bits.de/NRANEU/others/amd-us-archive/fm3-21.8\(07\).pdf](https://www.bits.de/NRANEU/others/amd-us-archive/fm3-21.8(07).pdf)
- [21] N. Mahmudov, «Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llarini izlab... [In search of a perfect study of language]», *O'zbek Tili Va Adab.*, вып. 5, с. 10, 2012.